arXiv:physics/0505150v1 [physics.plasm-ph] 22 May 2005

PLASMA DYNAMICS AND A SIGNIFICANT ERROR OF MACROSCOPIC AVERAGING

Marek A. Szałek

Institute of Fundamental Technological Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences
Świętokrzyska 21, 00-049 Warsaw, Poland
Address for correspondence: Krasnobrodzka 13 m. 94, 03-214 Warsaw, Poland
E-mail: mszalek@poczta.tp.pl

Abstract: The methods of macroscopic averaging used to derive the macroscopic Maxwell equations from electron theory are methodologically incorrect and lead in some cases to a substantial error. For instance, these methods do not take into account the existence of a macroscopic electromagnetic field $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ generated by carriers of electric charge moving in a thin layer adjacent to the boundary of the physical region containing these carriers. If this boundary is impenetrable for charged particles, then in its immediate vicinity all carriers are accelerated towards the inside of the region. The existence of the privileged direction of acceleration results in the generation of the macroscopic field $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$. The contributions to this field from individual accelerated particles are described with a sufficient accuracy by the Liénard-Wiechert formulas. In some cases the intensity of the field $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ is significant not only for deuteron plasma prepared for a controlled thermonuclear fusion reaction but also for electron plasma in conductors at room temperatures. The corrected procedures of macroscopic averaging will induce some changes in the present form of plasma dynamics equations. The modified equations will help to design improved systems of plasma confinement.

Key words: plasma dynamics equations, plasma for controlled thermonuclear fusion, electrodynamics of continuous media, macroscopic Maxwell equations.

PACS: 52.55.Dy; 52.30.-q; 03.50.De; (also: 05.20.Dd; 05.30.Fk; 52.25.Dg; 71.10.-w).

1. INTRODUCTION

The methods of macroscopic averaging used to derive the macroscopic Maxwell equations are based on two false mathematical assumptions and lead sometimes to false results. This will be explained in the present section.

It has been directly shown in my earlier paper (Szałek 1997) that the correct procedure of macroscopic averaging of the electromagnetic field generated by particles from a small macroscopic region P produces a field not always satisfying the macroscopic Maxwell equations. This follows from a simple example discussed in that paper or from comment 2 on p. 100 there. This result may be considered a consequence of the fact that each contribution to the field from an individual carrier leaving or entering P is discontinuous in time. It is different from zero when the generating carrier is in P (in the retarded time) and is equal to zero otherwise.

Therefore, none of these contributions satisfies the pertinent microscopic Maxwell equations, which invalidates, e.g., the formulas (45), (46) on p. 67 and (84), (85) on p. 113 in the book of de Groot (1969) as well as formulas (8) on p. 24 and (62) on p. 256 in the book of de Groot and Suttorp (1972). These formulas average the microscopic Maxwell equations with pseudo-solutions introduced to these equations, where the pseudo-solutions are the contributions to the electromagnetic field from individual carriers. The aim was to obtain the macroscopic electromagnetic field being the solution of the macroscopic Maxwell equations. This procedure is erroneous as the pseudo-solutions do not satisfy the pertinent microscopic Maxwell equations if the boundary of P is penetrable for carriers.

If a proof is erroneous, it need not necessarily mean that its thesis is incorrect. That, however, is not the case here, and the proper solutions of the macroscopic Maxwell equations not always describe correctly the macroscopic electromagnetic field. The differences between these solutions and the real macroscopic fields are sometimes surprisingly great. The proof is given in this paper in some cases when the macroscopic electric current does not flow through the boundary of the region P. Such an outcome has been already suggested by results of my earlier paper concerning some cases when the macroscopic current flows through the boundary of P. The results obtained in the present paper make it possible to propose in Section 2 a convenient procedure which will allow to calculate the correct value of the averaged electromagnetic field acting on charged particles in material media.

The derivation of the macroscopic Maxwell equations is also accompanied by another methodological error. Namely, the pertinent considerations take into account the distribution functions of particles depending only on space coordinates and on the velocities of carriers of electric charge. They disregard the distribution of carrier accelerations. Consequently, the particles with the same velocities but different accelerations are treated identically, although the fields generated by these particles are different. Such an approach may be justified when in a small macroscopic region, or in a thin layer adjacent to a privileged surface, the average acceleration of all carriers is equal to zero. This approach is incorrect when we consider a thin layer adjacent to the impenetrable boundary of a physical medium, where the average acceleration is different from zero and is directed towards the inside of the medium. It is also erroneous when we take into account an macroscopically inhomogeneous medium.

The considerations of this paper are based on the existence of the macroscopic electromagnetic field generated by carriers of electric charge accelerated in the immediate vicinity of impenetrable boundaries. This field has not been taken into account in the pertinent argumentation of other authors. Its intensity is sometimes astonishingly great, which indicates that the whole problem of the macroscopic electromagnetic field in material media should be meticulously reconsidered.

This paper is an abbreviated and simplified version of my earlier paper "Plasma dynamics and boundary phenomena in macroscopic averaging" formulated in 2002/2003. In that paper results concerning the correct calculation of the macroscopic electromagnetic field have been obtained in an exact and systematic manner in the general case of curved boundaries and real physical media. Certain considerations there, however, seem rather difficult for some physicists, and the exactness of the argumentation has made that paper relatively long (25 pages). To

make the argumentation of the present paper shorter and simpler, we idealize to some extent the properties of the media in the vicinity of the impenetrable boundary. We also assume that the boundaries are plane. Nevertheless, the results obtained here agree with the results of that earlier paper. These of the more important results of the latter which have not been derived here, are repeated without proofs in Section 5. We have also retained some methodological remarks which are given in Section 6. That earlier paper is available from the author on request electronically in a form of a pdf file.

2. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Consider a macroscopic bounded region P containing a plasma or a typical metal without significant magnetic properties. We denote the boundary of P by ∂P and assume that ∂P is composed of two sufficiently regular surfaces $\partial_1 P$ and $\partial_2 P$. The surface $\partial_2 P$ is impenetrable for carriers of electric charge.

Let $\mathbf{J}$ and ρ be the macroscopic densities of, respectively, electric current and charge in P, and let the normal to ∂P component of $\mathbf{J}$ vanish identically on ∂P. Let $\mathbf{E}_0$, $\mathbf{H}_0$ denote respectively the electric and magnetic field being the solution of the Maxwell equations with the densities $\mathbf{J}$ and ρ, and satisfying the proper boundary conditions. If $\mathbf{J} \equiv 0$, $\rho \equiv 0$ in P, then $\mathbf{E}_0 \equiv 0$, $\mathbf{H}_0 \equiv 0$. According to the present opinions the field $\mathbf{E}_0$, $\mathbf{H}_0$ is equal to the macroscopic electromagnetic field $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{H}$ generated by particles from the region P:

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_0, \qquad \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_0. \tag{1}$$

The field $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{H}$ is the sum of contributions to the macroscopic electromagnetic field from all particles in P. We shall show that in order to describe correctly this field, one should take into account in some cases not only the field $\mathbf{E}_0$, $\mathbf{H}_0$, but also two other macroscopic fields which will be denoted by $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ and $\mathbf{E}_T$, $\mathbf{H}_T$. The field $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ is generated by carriers accelerated in the immediate vicinity of the boundary $\partial_2 P$. For all carriers this acceleration is directed towards the interior of P and is induced by forces which make $\partial_2 P$ impenetrable. The existence of the privileged direction of acceleration causes that the sum of contributions to the field $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ from particular carriers does not vanish. It will be shown that the intensity of the field $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ can be significant even in some cases of electron plasma in conductors at room temperatures. We shall refer to this field as "the boundary acceleration electromagnetic field."

If $\mathbf{E}_0 \equiv 0$, $\mathbf{H}_0 \equiv 0$, then the field $\mathbf{E}_T$, $\mathbf{H}_T$ is the sum of contributions, respectively, to the macroscopic electric and magnetic field, generated by all particles from P with the exception of the contributions used to calculate $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$. If $\mathbf{E}_0 \neq 0$ or $\mathbf{H}_0 \neq 0$, then we define that this sum is equal to $\mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{E}_T$, $\mathbf{H}_0 + \mathbf{H}_T$ We shall call the field $\mathbf{E}_T$, $\mathbf{H}_T$ "the temperature electromagnetic field."

Let $[\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{H}]$ be an ordered pair and $[\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{H}] = [\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h}]$ if and only if $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{h}$. Let

$$\mathbf{G} = [\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{H}], \qquad \mathbf{G}_0 = [\mathbf{E}_0, \mathbf{H}_0], \qquad \mathbf{G}_B = [\mathbf{E}_B, \mathbf{H}_B], \qquad \mathbf{G}_T = [\mathbf{E}_T, \mathbf{H}_T]. \tag{2}$$

Using this notation we may write the correct expression for the field $\mathbf{G}$ in the form

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_0 + \mathbf{G}_B + \mathbf{G}_T. \tag{3}$$

This and the next equations concern the fields $\mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{G}_B$, $\mathbf{G}_T$ in observation points lying outside the region P and its immediate vicinity. The fields $\mathbf{G}_B$ and $\mathbf{G}_T$ may be ignored when

$$\mathbf{G}_B + \mathbf{G}_T = 0. \tag{4}$$

We shall show, however, that in some cases equation (4) is not satisfied.

First, consider the case when the plasma in P is homogeneous and isotropic. Let $|\mathbf{G}| = |\mathbf{E}| + |\mathbf{H}|$ where $|\mathbf{E}|$, $|\mathbf{H}|$ are the lengths of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{H}$. It follows from the results obtained in the present paper that if $\partial_2 P = \partial P$, then $|\mathbf{G}_B|$ vanishes or is relatively small. We may expect the same from $|\mathbf{G}_T|$ taking into account equation (4), the validity of which is in this case suggested, e.g., by the experimental fact that the electromagnetic field produced by carriers from any region P with impenetrable boundaries, and averaged in a short interval of time, is at the outside of P and its immediate vicinity equal to zero with a good accuracy for media under consideration if the macroscopic densities $\mathbf{J}$ and ρ vanish in P.

The situation changes substantially when $\partial_2 P \neq \partial P$ and $\partial_2 P$ is not a closed surface. In such cases $|\mathbf{G}_T|$ remains roughly the same while $|\mathbf{G}_B|$ can become surprisingly large. For instance, one impenetrable face of a copper cube with the length of edge equal to 1 cm produces at a temperature of 300 K the fields $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ which in some points at a distance of 1 m from the center of the cube have the intensity of about, respectively, $10^{11}\,\mathrm{V\,m^{-1}}$ and $10^{8}\,\mathrm{A\,m^{-1}}$. If the cube were filled with a rarefied deuteron plasma prepared for a controlled thermonuclear fusion reaction, then the corresponding intensities would be about $10^{6}\,\mathrm{V\,m^{-1}}$ and $10^{4}\,\mathrm{A\,m^{-1}}$. We can obtain then from (3)

$$|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}_0| = |\mathbf{G}_B + \mathbf{G}_T| \gg 0. \tag{5}$$

In particular, we can get $|\mathbf{G}| \gg 0$ when $\mathbf{J} \equiv 0$, $\rho \equiv 0$ in P. A proof of inequality (5) for $\mathbf{G}_0 \equiv 0$ is given in Section 3.

Inequality (5) is interesting from the theoretical point of view, because it evidently disagrees with equations (1) and with some universally accepted opinions concerning the macroscopic electromagnetic field generated by large sets of charged particles in chaotic motion. There are two main reasons of the disagreement between the results obtained in the present paper and the pertinent results of other authors. First, the methods of macroscopic averaging of electromagnetic fields applied in the scientific literature do not take into account the existence of the macroscopic boundary acceleration field $\mathbf{G}_B$ generated in a locally microscopic layer adjacent to $\partial_2 P$. Second, it has not been noticed that for inhomogeneous or anisotropic media the temperature field $\mathbf{G}_T$ may be different from zero and attain considerable intensities. An additional reason of the disagreement is the discontinuity in time of the contributions to the macroscopic electromagnetic field from individual carriers, which has been already explained in Section 1.

If the medium in P is inhomogeneous and/or anisotropic, then $|\mathbf{G}_B|$ can become relatively very large even if $\partial_2 P = \partial P$ or $\partial_2 P$ is a closed surface. This may have practical consequences. It will be explained in the following example.

Suppose that we want to calculate an averaged electromagnetic field $\mathbf{G}' = [\mathbf{E}', \mathbf{H}']$ acting on electrons and ions at a point O of a region P' with a boundary $\partial P'$. There are various methods

of calculating this field. All of them need some corrections because they do not allow for the existence of the fields $\mathbf{G}_B$, $\mathbf{G}_T$. We shall point out a method where the manner of correction is obvious.

Let the medium in P' be inhomogeneous and the surface $\partial P'$ be impenetrable for carriers. To facilitate the considerations we assume that the medium inhomogeneities are stable, as in inhomogeneous alloys of metals. Consider in P' a small subregion P_S with a boundary ∂P_S such that $O \in P_S$ and lies possibly far from ∂P_S. We may write down

$$\mathbf{G}' = \mathbf{G}_S + \mathbf{G} \tag{6}$$

where the field $\mathbf{G}_S$ is generated by particles from inside the region P_S, and the field $\mathbf{G}$ is produced by particles from inside the region P defined by $P = P' - P_S$. The field $\mathbf{G}_S$ may be calculated by means of summing the contributions from all particles in P_S with the exception of a privileged particle, while the field $\mathbf{G}$ is calculated by means of the macroscopic densities $\mathbf{J}$ and ρ in P. The standard practice is to assume that the latter field satisfies (1), i.e. $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_0$.

On the ground of results obtained in this paper it can be shown that the assumption (1) is not always correct even if $\mathbf{G}_0 = 0$. This is a consequence of the facts that $\partial P = \partial P' + \partial P_S$, and that the surface ∂P_S is penetrable for carriers and does not generate a contribution to the field $\mathbf{G}_B$. Let the contribution generated at $\partial P'$ to the field $\mathbf{G}_B$ be $\mathbf{G}'_B$ and let the normal to ∂P_S component of $\mathbf{J}$ vanish on ∂P_S. We denote by $\mathbf{G}_{BS}$ the contribution to the boundary acceleration field which would be produced at ∂P_S by particles from P if ∂P_S were impenetrable for carriers. In such a case the whole boundary ∂P of P would be impenetrable for carriers. Therefore, we obtain from (4)

$$\mathbf{G}_T + \mathbf{G}'_B + \mathbf{G}_{BS} = 0. \tag{7}$$

We receive from (3) when ∂P_S is penetrable:

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_0 + \mathbf{G}'_B + \mathbf{G}_T. \tag{8}$$

From (7) and (8) we get

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_0 - \mathbf{G}_{BS}. \tag{9}$$

An example is given in Section 4, which indicates that in inhomogeneous plasma one can obtain $|\mathbf{G}_{BS}| \gg 0$ as in (30). Consequently, instead of the incorrect formula (1), we should use equation (9). From (6) and (9) we get the correct expression for the field $\mathbf{G}'$:

$$\mathbf{G}' = \mathbf{G}_S + \mathbf{G}_0 - \mathbf{G}_{BS}. \tag{10}$$

At this stage of the research one cannot exclude the possibility that the presence of the term $\mathbf{G}_{BS}$ in (10) can have a noticeable influence on the value of $\mathbf{G}'$. Such an influence should cause some changes in the present form of plasma dynamics equations. One can expect the greatest values of $|\mathbf{G}_{BS}|$ in the regions where the strongest inhomogeneities are present, e.g., on a shock wave.

In general, the field $\mathbf{G}_{BS}$ will depend on the derivatives of plasma density and temperature. Hence, its existence could cause some changes of values of the coefficients of partial derivatives

in the plasma dynamics equations. In particular, some coefficients equal to zero in the present form of these equations might become different from zero. Even small differences may affect, e.g., results concerning the growth and propagation of plasma instabilities. In order to examine the consequences of equation (10) one should derive the explicit dependence of the field $\mathbf{G}_{BS}$ on the macroscopic parameters of inhomogeneous plasma, and investigate relations between $\mathbf{G}_{BS}$ and the coefficients in the plasma dynamics equations.

The proper methodology pointed out in this paper will be useful not only when one examines the consequences of equation (10) but also when it is possible to investigate the influence of some additional forces generated by electrically charged particles. These forces have been discovered by the present author and are briefly described in an earlier paper (Szałek 1997). Allowing for all forces produced by electrically charged particles, one will be able to obtain, e.g., an adequate description of phenomena occurring in boundary regions of globular lightnings. Such a description will be connected with further changes in the plasma dynamics equations. The modified equations will help to design improved systems of plasma confinement.

The temperature and boundary acceleration fields are generated in various media and should be taken into account in the completed macroscopic theory of electromagnetic fields based on the microscopic properties of electrons, ions, and atoms. This theory came into existence a century ago, although some of its important premises were known much earlier – compare, e.g., the early theories of dielectrics or Ampère's hypothesis that magnetism is due to micro-currents. First results concerning the derivation of macroscopic Maxwell equations from electron theory were obtained by Hendrik A. Lorentz (see, e.g., Lorentz 1902, 1904, 1915). A list of authors working on this problem and a historical survey were given by de Groot (1969). First results concerning the fields $\mathbf{G}_B$ and $\mathbf{G}_T$ were published by the present author (Szałek 1997). That paper contains, e.g., an estimate of the ratio $|\mathbf{H}_B + \mathbf{H}_T|/|\mathbf{H}_0|$ (using the nomenclature introduced here) in some cases when P is a cylinder and $\partial_2 P$ is the lateral surface of this cylinder. Because of lack of funds for the pertinent research, my next paper on this subject was written with a delay of more than 5 years.

3. A PROOF OF INEQUALITY (5)

3.1. The field of a moving charge

We shall calculate in sections 3.2 and 3.3 the contributions to the macroscopic electromagnetic field from particular carriers using some approximate expressions resulting from the exact Liénard-Wiechert formulas (Liénard 1898, Wiechert 1900). In the SI systems of units these expressions may be written down in the form

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x},t) = \mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_u, \qquad \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x},t) = \mathbf{h}_a + \mathbf{h}_u, \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x},t)$, $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x},t)$ are, respectively, the electric and magnetic field generated by a moving point charge Q and observed at a point $\mathbf{x}$ at time t,

$$\mathbf{e}_a(\mathbf{x},t) = L_1 R_1^{-1} \mathbf{n}_1 \times (\mathbf{n}_1 \times \mathbf{a}), \qquad \mathbf{h}_a(\mathbf{x},t) = c\varepsilon_0 \mathbf{n}_1 \times \mathbf{e}_a, \tag{12}$$

$$\mathbf{e}_u(\mathbf{x},t) = c^2 L_1 (1 - u^2/c^2) w^3 R_1^{-2} (\mathbf{n}_1 - \mathbf{u}/c), \qquad \mathbf{h}_u(\mathbf{x},t) = c\varepsilon_0 \mathbf{n}_1 \times \mathbf{e}_u, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_1(t) = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{r}(t)$; $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{r}$ are, respectively, the position vectors of the observation point and the point charge in a Cartesian rectangular coordinate system X with the coordinates x_1, x_2, x_3; $R_1 = |\mathbf{R}_1|$, $\mathbf{n}_1(t) = \mathbf{R}_1/R_1$; $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{u}$ are, respectively, the acceleration and velocity of the point charge; $\varepsilon_0 = 8.85\times10^{-12}\,\mathrm{F\,m^{-1}}$, c is the speed of light, and

$$L_1 = Q(4\pi\varepsilon_0 c^2)^{-1}, \qquad w = (1 - \mathbf{n}_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}/c)^{-1}. \tag{14}$$

We have neglected in (12) and (13) the time retardation, and in (12) we have retained only the first term of the expansion with respect to the powers of u/c. The exact formulas may be found in various books and monographs (see, e.g., Clemmow and Dougherty 1969). They are also used in my previous pertinent paper.

3.2. Introductory considerations

Consider two identical macroscopic cubes $P^{(i)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ containing a suitable homogeneous medium with the macroscopic properties not depending on time. We assume for the sake of simplicity that the ions of the medium are at rest in $P^{(i)}$ (see, however, remark 2 in Section 5). The cube $P^{(1)}$ is inside the medium and its boundary $\partial P^{(1)} = \partial_1 P^{(1)}$ is fully penetrable for electrons. The cube $P^{(2)}$ is adjacent to the boundary of the medium and one of its faces (denoted by $\partial_2 P^{(2)}$) is impenetrable for electrons while the remaining boundary $\partial_1 P^{(2)}$ of $P^{(2)}$ is penetrable.

Let $\mathbf{G}^{(i)}$, $\mathbf{G}_B^{(i)}$, $\mathbf{G}_T^{(i)}$ denote, respectively, the macroscopic electromagnetic fields, the boundary acceleration electromagnetic fields, and the temperature electromagnetic fields generated by charged particles from $P^{(i)}$, and let $\mathbf{G}_0^{(i)}$ be the proper solutions of the macroscopic Maxwell equations in $P^{(i)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$. These fields will be calculated in observation points lying outside the cubes $P^{(i)}$, sufficiently far from their boundaries. We shall prove that at least one of the fields $\mathbf{G}^{(i)}$ satisfies the formula (5)

Assume that the macroscopic current and charge densities in $P^{(i)}$ are identically equal to zero. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{G}_0^{(i)} \equiv 0, \qquad\qquad i = 1, 2. \tag{15}$$

Let $\mathbf{e}_a$, $\mathbf{h}_a$, $\mathbf{e}_u$, $\mathbf{h}_u$ be given by (12) and (13). The equation (15) being satisfied, we can calculate the field $\mathbf{G}_T^{(1)}$ by summing up the contributions $[\mathbf{e}_a,\mathbf{h}_a]$, $[\mathbf{e}_u,\mathbf{h}_u]$ from all particles in $P^{(1)}$ (i.e. from electron carriers and ions in $P^{(1)}$, the contributions from ions being given in our case by the Coulomb field). These contributions are averaged in a short interval of time when necessary.

Assume now that the barrier of forces making the face $\partial_2 P^{(2)}$ impenetrable is sufficiently strong and steep to decelerate and accelerate the carriers within a distance κ which is small in comparison with the average distance between carriers in $P^{(2)}$. Let $\Delta P^{(2)}$ be a boundary layer with a thickness κ adjacent to the face $\partial_2 P^{(2)}$, and $\Delta P^{(1)}$ be a corresponding layer in $P^{(1)}$. To calculate $\mathbf{G}_T^{(2)}$, we sum up the contributions $[\mathbf{e}_a,\mathbf{h}_a]$, $[\mathbf{e}_u,\mathbf{h}_u]$ from all carriers and ions in $P^{(2)} - \Delta P^{(2)}$ and add the contributions $[\mathbf{e}_u,\mathbf{h}_u]$ from all particles in $\Delta P^{(2)}$. We do not take into account the contributions $[\mathbf{e}_a,\mathbf{h}_a]$ from $\Delta P^{(2)}$, because they are used to calculate the field $\mathbf{G}_B^{(2)}$.

If κ is sufficiently small, then in the corresponding points of observation

$$\mathbf{G}_T^{(1)} = \mathbf{G}_T^{(2)} = \mathbf{G}_T, \tag{16}$$

since the properties and velocity distributions of particles are identical in $P^{(i)} - \Delta P^{(i)}$, and we may neglect the contributions $[\mathbf{e}_a,\mathbf{h}_a]$, $[\mathbf{e}_u,\mathbf{h}_u]$ from particles in $\Delta P^{(1)}$ and the contributions $[\mathbf{e}_u,\mathbf{h}_u]$ from particles in $\Delta P^{(2)}$, as the bounds of all these contributions do not depend on κ. The equation (16) being satisfied, we shall need no more information concerning the fields $\mathbf{G}_T^{(i)}$ to prove the formula (5). However, we must calculate the fields $\mathbf{G}_B^{(i)}$. We have

$$\mathbf{G}_B^{(1)} \equiv 0, \tag{17}$$

because all contributions $[\mathbf{e}_a,\mathbf{h}_a]$, $[\mathbf{e}_u,\mathbf{h}_u]$ from all particles in $P^{(1)}$ have been already used to calculate the field $\mathbf{G}_T^{(1)}$. It remains to calculate $\mathbf{G}_B^{(2)}$.

3.3. The field $\mathbf{G}_B^{(2)}$

Let points $\mathbf{x}'$ with coordinates x'_1, x'_2, x'_3 in the Cartesian system X denote points belonging to $P^{(2)}$. We define for a positive ν that $P^{(2)}$ is given by formulas: $x'_1, x'_2 \in [-\nu, \nu]$, $x'_3 \in [-2\nu, 0]$, and that $\partial_2 P^{(2)}$ lies on the plane $x'_3 = 0$. Let $\mathbf{K}$ be a unit vector normal to the plane $x'_3 = 0$ and pointing in the positive direction of the x_3-axis.

Assume for the sake of simplicity that all electron carriers move only in the x_3-direction, and that all of them have the same speed u outside the boundary layer $\Delta P^{(2)}$ (the results obtained by means of this assumption may be easily generalized for some more general cases). In the layer $\Delta P^{(2)}$ each electron stays during a time t_κ while it is accelerated from the velocity $+u\mathbf{K}$ to the velocity $-u\mathbf{K}$. Integrating $\mathbf{e}_a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ from (12) with respect to time during the time t_κ, we obtain the averaged in a unit time contribution $\delta\mathbf{E}_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ to the field $\mathbf{E}_B^{(2)}$ from one carrier. Let $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{x}$, $R = |\mathbf{R}|$, $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{R}/R$ (R is the distance from the center of the face $\partial_2 P^{(2)}$ to the observation point). If $R \gg \nu + \kappa$ then with a good accuracy $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{R}$ and $\delta\mathbf{E}_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) = -2L_1 u R^{-1}\mathbf{n}\times(\mathbf{n}\times\mathbf{K})$.

If the number density of electron carriers in $P^{(2)}$ is Φ_0, then the number of collisions with the layer $\Delta P^{(2)}$ per unit area and time is $u\Phi_0/2$. Therefore, we obtain $\mathbf{E}_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) = -\Delta S\, L_1 \Phi_0 u^2 R^{-1}\mathbf{n}\times(\mathbf{n}\times\mathbf{K})$ where ΔS is the area of $\partial_2 P^{(2)}$. Taking into account (14), we can write

$$\mathbf{E}_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) = -\Delta S\, L R^{-1}\, \mathbf{n}\times(\mathbf{n}\times\mathbf{K}) \tag{18}$$

where

$$L = (2\pi\, m\, \varepsilon_0 c^2)^{-1}\, Q\, \Phi_0\, W', \qquad W' = mu^2/2, \tag{19}$$

m is the mass of electron.

Similarly, integrating $\mathbf{h}_a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ from (12), we get

$$\mathbf{H}_B^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) = \Delta S\, c\varepsilon_0 L R^{-1}\, \mathbf{n}\times\mathbf{K}. \tag{20}$$

Using the above method of derivation, one can also obtain the expressions for $\mathbf{G}_B^{(2)}$ in the general case when the electrons move in 3 space directions and have different velocities. In such a case, one gets the same expressions (18) and (20). The only difference is that W' in (19) should be replaced by

$$W = (1/2)\, k\, T\, \eta(T) \tag{21}$$

where W is the average kinetic energy of electrons per one degree of freedom, k is Boltzmann's constant, T denotes the temperature of electrons in kelvins, and η is a dimensionless coefficient equal to one for particles having the classical distribution of velocities. Some values of L and η for copper, silver, and a deuteron plasma are given in Appendix.

Suppose that the values of Φ_0 and u or W for electron carriers in cubes $P^{(i)}$ are similar to those for carriers in copper at 300 K. Using the data from formulas (A7) in Appendix, we get then from (18) and (20) the numerical values of $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ mentioned in Section 2 for copper cube. Therefore, we obtain

$$|\mathbf{G}_B^{(2)}| \gg 0. \tag{22}$$

3.4. Conclusions

From (3), (15), (16), and (17), we get

$$\mathbf{G}^{(1)} = \mathbf{G}_T, \qquad \mathbf{G}^{(2)} = \mathbf{G}_T + \mathbf{G}_B^{(2)}. \tag{23}$$

Hence, taking into account (22), we obtain that at least one of the following inequalities must be true:

$$|\mathbf{G}^{(1)}| \gg 0, \qquad |\mathbf{G}^{(2)}| \gg 0, \tag{24}$$

which proves the formula (5).

As it has been already pointed out in Section 2, the result (24) does not agree with the results which can be obtained by means of the presently used methods of macroscopic averaging. These methods lead in our case to the conclusion that $\mathbf{G}^{(i)} \equiv \mathbf{G}_0^{(i)} \equiv 0 \quad (i = 1, 2)$, because in both cases the macroscopic current and charge densities are equal to zero. One of the reasons of this contradiction is the fact that when we calculate the macroscopic field generated by carriers from $P^{(i)}$, the contributions to this field from carriers leaving or entering $P^{(i)}$ are discontinuous in time and do not satisfy the pertinent microscopic Maxwell equations. This invalidates, e.g., the indicated in Section 1 formulas given by de Groot (1969), and de Groot and Suttorp (1972).

4. FIELD $\mathbf{E}_{BS}$ GENERATED BY A SURFACE ∂P_S IN AN INHOMOGENEOUS CONDUCTOR

Let R_0 , ψ $(R_0 \gg \psi)$ be positive constants. Consider a cube P' defined by

$$x_i' \in [-2R_0, 2R_0], \qquad i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{25}$$

The cube contains an inhomogeneous alloy of silver and copper. On every surface $x_3' = constant$ the alloy is homogeneous. For $x_3' < -\psi$ the medium in P' is a homogeneous copper while for $x_3' > \psi$ the medium in P' is a homogeneous silver. Let $2\psi = 0.01\,\mathrm{cm}$, $R_0 = 1\,\mathrm{cm}$.

Consider in P' a cylinder P_S defined by

$$(x_1')^2 + (x_2')^2 \leq R_0, \qquad |x_3'| \leq 1.1\psi, \tag{26}$$

We denote the lateral surface of P_S by $\partial_L P_S$ and the bases of P_S by $\partial_{b1} P_S$ and $\partial_{b2} P_S$. The base $\partial_{b1} P_S$ lies on the surface $x'_3 = -1.1\psi$. Assume that the boundary of P_S is impenetrable for electrons. We shall calculate the boundary acceleration field $\mathbf{E}_{BS}$ generated by electrons from P ($P = P' - P_S$) accelerated at the boundary of P_S. Let the observation point $\mathbf{x}$ lie in the center of P_S, i.e. $\mathbf{x} = (0, 0, 0)$. Let $\mathbf{E}_{BS1}$, $\mathbf{E}_{BS2}$, $\mathbf{E}_{BSL}$ be the contributions to $\mathbf{E}_{BS}$ generated by electrons accelerated at $\partial_{b1} P_S$, $\partial_{b2} P_S$, and $\partial_L P_S$, respectively.

Integrating formula (18) with respect to S over the base $\partial_{b1} P_S$ in suitable polar coordinates, one obtains:

$$\mathbf{E}_{BS1} = 2\pi L \mathbf{K} R_{01}^{-1} (R_{01} - 1.1\psi)^2 \quad \text{where} \quad R_{01} = (R_0^2 + 1.1^2 \psi^2)^{(1/2)} \tag{27}$$

(a more detailed derivation of formulas (27) to (30) is given in sections 5.2 and 5.3 of my previous pertinent paper, available electronically). In our case ($R_0 \gg \psi$) we get with a good accuracy $\mathbf{E}_{BS1} = 2\pi L_{Cu} R_0 \mathbf{K}$ where L_{Cu} is the value of L for electrons in copper. Similarly, $\mathbf{E}_{BS2} = -2\pi L_{Ag} R_0 \mathbf{K}$. Hence

$$\mathbf{E}_{BSb} \equiv \mathbf{E}_{BS1} + \mathbf{E}_{BS2} = L_2 R_0 \mathbf{K}, \qquad L_2 = 2\pi (L_{Cu} - L_{Ag}). \tag{28}$$

If κ is sufficiently small, then it can be easily proved that the field $\mathbf{E}_{BSL}$ can be estimated by integrating formula (18) with suitably changed $\mathbf{K}$ over $\partial_L P_S$. In our case ($2\psi = 0.01\,\mathrm{cm}$, $R_0 = 1\,\mathrm{cm}$) one can obtain an estimate $|\mathbf{E}_{BSL}|/|\mathbf{E}_{BSb}| < 3{\times}10^{-4}$ if one puts Φ_0 in the integrand twice as big as Φ_0 for copper. Therefore, with a good accuracy

$$\mathbf{E}_{BS} = \mathbf{E}_{BSb} + \mathbf{E}_{BSL} = L_2 R_0 \mathbf{K}. \tag{29}$$

From (28) and (A7) we get $L_2 = -3.9{\times}10^{15}\,\mathrm{V\,m^{-2}}$ at $300\,\mathrm{K}$ and

$$|\mathbf{E}_{BS}| > 3.5{\times}10^{13}\,\mathrm{V\,m^{-1}} \tag{30}$$

for $R_0 = 1\,\mathrm{cm}$. We see that the field $\mathbf{E}_{BS}$ generated by particles from $P' - P_S$ accelerated in the immediate vicinity of the whole boundary ∂P_S may reach surprisingly great values even when the diameter of P_S is small.

5. REMARKS

This paper is a shorter and simpler version of my earlier paper described in Introduction. These of the more important results of that paper which have not been derived in the present paper are concisely formulated without proofs in the following remarks. Some methodological remarks have been also retained and are given in the next section. The earlier paper is available from the author on request electronically.

Remark 1. It can be proved that formulas (18), (20) with expressions (19), where W' is replaced by W from (21), are also valid for a general medium where the thickness of the boundary layer κ is comparable to, or greater than, the mean free path l of carriers in P (the definition of κ in such a general case is given in the earlier paper). They are also valid for curved

boundaries when the moduli of radii of normal curvatures are sufficiently big in comparison with κ and l, and in some cases when the latter condition is not satisfied.

Remark 2. If the ions in P move and collide with the boundary $\partial_2 P$, then we must also take into account the boundary acceleration field produced by ions. This field is described by the same formulas (18), (20) with the data for electrons in expressions (19) and (21) replaced by the data for ions. Let the subscripts i and e label the quantities referring, respectively, to ions or nuclei and electrons. If, for instance, all ions have the same charge Q_i and mass m_i, we get from (19) and (21)

$$|L_i/L_e| = (\eta_i/\eta_e)\, m_e/m_i$$

as $|Q_i\Phi_{0i}| = |Q_e\Phi_{0e}|$. In this and in the other cases, the contribution to $\mathbf{E}_B$, $\mathbf{H}_B$ from nuclei or ions may be usually neglected in comparison with the contribution from electrons, since the ratio m_e/m_i is small and $\eta_i/\eta_e \leq 1$.

Remark 3. Formulas (18), (20) with (19) and (21) result from expressions (12). The latter are the first terms of the expansions with respect to the powers of u/c of the exact expressions. Therefore, (18) and (20) are also the first terms of the expansions of the exact boundary acceleration field $\mathbf{G}_B^R$. If P contains a homogeneous medium, then the formulas (18), (20) integrated over the closed surface ∂P vanish. In our cases the values of L are very large and the values of u/c are not very small (see Appendix). Therefore, one should consider the influence of further terms of the expansions of $\mathbf{G}_B^R$. Some partial results suggest that the second terms of these expansions integrated over ∂P may be different from zero for plasma in magnetic traps, even when the plasma were homogeneous.

Remark 4. Let $\mathbf{G}_0 \neq 0$. Assume that $\mathbf{G}_0 = \mathbf{G}_{01} + \mathbf{G}_{02}$ where $\mathbf{G}_{01}$ does not depend on t and $|\mathbf{G}_{02}|$ is sufficiently small. In general, the density $\mathbf{J}$ and the field $\mathbf{G}_{01}$ may influence the velocity distribution functions of particles in P. Hence the fields $\mathbf{G}_B$ and $\mathbf{G}_T$ may depend on $\mathbf{J}$ and ρ. However, if we assume that (4) holds for $\mathbf{J} \neq 0$, $\rho \neq 0$ when $\partial_2 P{=}\partial P$ or that $|\mathbf{J}|$, $|\rho|$ are sufficiently small, then formulas (9) and (10) remain valid.

6. METHODOLOGICAL REMARKS

Remark M1. The aim of this paper is a presentation of some new results deduced from the Maxwell equations with microscopic charge and current densities. These results concern averaged macroscopic electromagnetic field generated by large sets of moving charged particles. We do not know the position and velocity of any particular particle, and may use only statistical information given by velocity distribution functions for various particle species in P. Nevertheless, we assume that the positions and velocities of particles are continuous functions of time. Such an assumption is necessary to use, e.g., the Liénard-Wiechert formulas. Without it any results concerning the electromagnetic field generated by sets of moving carriers are not a deduction from the Maxwell equations with microscopic sources even if they are an inference from some inductive extensions of these equations used in quantum theories. Therefore, we shall introduce a natural model based on this assumption and taking into account quantum considerations.

Let the region P contain N carriers with the same total electric charge Q and rest mass m, and let b denote a sufficiently small positive number. Let the macroscopic number density of these carriers be $\Phi(\mathbf{x},t)$ and their velocity distribution function be $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u},t)$. For sets of degenerate particles, such as electron plasma in metal conductors, the values of $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u},t)$ may result from quantum theories. We define in P a set of N privileged points with the following properties. The positions and velocities of these points are continuous functions of time, and their accelerations are piecewise continuous functions. Their trajectories do not cross $\partial_2 P$. At a time t_0 their macroscopic number density is equal to $\Phi(\mathbf{x},t_0)$. If the distance between two privileged points is less than $2b$, then they are strongly accelerated in random directions. Suitably choosing the distribution of such accelerations, we may ensure that the number density and velocity distribution of privileged points in P are given by $\Phi(\mathbf{x},t)$ and $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u},t)$, respectively.

We regard each privileged point as a point belonging to the region occupied by a particle with the charge Q and rest mass m. When we write that particle p is at a point $\mathbf{x}$ at a time t, we mean that privileged point p is at $\mathbf{x}$ at t. All species of particles in P can be represented in this way. We may allow interactions between privileged points of different kinds of particles if we care about a more realistic description of collisions.

Procedures equivalent to the setting of privileged points are universally used in statistical physics. For instance, they were explicitly or implicitly used by de Groot and Suttorp (1972), Ferziger and Kaper (1972), Landau and Lifshitz (1964), Schram (1991).

Remark M2. Let d^3x be a small volume in the system X in P, u_n be the components of $\mathbf{u}$ in X, and d^3u be a small volume in the velocity space u_n. Assume that at a time t the expected number $\mathrm{d}N(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u},t)$ of particles of a given species in the volume element d^3x located at $\mathbf{x}$, whose velocities lie in d^3u about velocity $\mathbf{u}$ is given with a sufficient accuracy by the formula

$$\mathrm{d}N(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u},t) = f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})\,\mathrm{d}^3x\,\mathrm{d}^3u$$

where the velocity distribution function $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})$ does not depend on t.

Taking into account regions in the vicinity of the boundary $\partial_2 P$, it may be sometimes convenient to consider subregions of P which are too small to contain a large number of particles (see, e.g., the next remark). We may then take into account a set of identical regions P_n ($n = 1,2,\ldots,I_{en}$). In each region P_m ($m > 1$) the privileged points of all particles are located at a time t in the same points in which they were located in P_{m-1} at a time $t - \delta t$. Considering all privileged points from all P_m, we obtain for them the velocity distribution function f_{en} equal to $I_{en} f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})$. The reasoning may be then carried out for f_{en} instead of f. The final result should be divided by I_{en}. This approach makes $\mathrm{d}N$ well defined even when $\mathrm{d}N < 1$. This is one of possible procedures making the concept of the velocity distribution function useful also in idealized or averaged microscopic regions. Such an averaging may be performed, e.g., in the microscopic vicinity of $\partial_2 P$ on microscopic layers parallel to $\partial_2 P$.

Remark M3. We assume throughout this paper that the boundary $\partial_2 P$ is impenetrable for carriers of electric charge. The form of the functions $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u})$ in a vicinity of $\partial_2 P$ depends on the averaged distribution of forces acting on carriers in the neighborhood of $\partial_2 P$. This distribution depends on the kind of medium in P and its theoretical idealization. We can also introduce

artificial boundaries and postulate extremal or not typical mechanisms of their impenetrability. In each case the forces acting in the vicinity of an impenetrable surface cause the averaged acceleration of particles to have a not vanishing resultant pointing into P. Consequently the number densities of carriers and the functions $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ for various species of particles must, in general, depend on the distance from the point $\mathbf{x}$ to such a surface for $\mathbf{x}$ in a neighborhood of this surface. The only exception concerns the case when the barrier of forces making the boundary $\partial_2 P$ impenetrable is sufficiently strong and steep to decelerate and accelerate the carriers within a distance which is very small in comparison with the average distance between particles in P.

Remark M4. Consider a moving charged particle with the total electric charge Q. The electromagnetic field $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{H}$ generated by this particle and observed at the point $\mathbf{x}$ and time t may be written as

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathbf{e}'(\mathbf{x}, t), \qquad \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathbf{h}'(\mathbf{x}, t),$$

where the field $\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{h}$ is equal to the field which would be generated in a vacuum by the charge Q located in the privileged point related to this particle. The field $\mathbf{e}'$, $\mathbf{h}'$ is a correction to the field $\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{h}$. This correction may be produced owing to the following reasons: the charge is not located in the privileged point, its density is finite, the charge density is strongly inhomogeneous and of opposite sign in some subregions of the particle, there are electric currents flowing and/or oscillating inside the particle, there are electric currents caused by the rotation of the whole particle. Let $\mathcal{E}'_\Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\mathcal{H}'_\Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ be the sum of corrections $\mathbf{e}'$, $\mathbf{h}'$ from all particles in P, averaged in a short interval of time. The value of this sum depends on the kind of medium in P. In this paper we assume that if $\mathbf{x}$ is outside P and its immediate vicinity, then $\mathcal{E}'_\Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0$, $\mathcal{H}'_\Sigma(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0$ with a sufficient accuracy. This is equivalent to the assumption that outside P and its immediate vicinity we may neglect the total field of all electric and magnetic multipoles which may be introduced in order to describe the fields $\mathbf{e}'$, $\mathbf{h}'$ generated by all particles in P.

Remark M5. The field $\mathbf{G}_0$ generated by $\mathbf{J}$ and ρ in P is usually calculated by means of the retarded vector and scalar potentials $\mathbf{A}$ and φ. If, for instance, the medium in and outside P is homogeneous, and its permeability and dielectric constant are equal to 1, then the potential $\mathbf{A}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \int_P d^3x' \, |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|^{-1} \, \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}', t_d)$$

where $t_d = t - c^{-1}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|$, and the potential $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is given by the analogical expression (see, e.g., Bochenek 1961). These potentials may be used to calculate the field $\mathbf{G}_0$ if the Lorentz condition $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} + c^{-2} \, \partial\varphi/\partial t = 0$ is satisfied. This always takes place when the normal to ∂P component of $\mathbf{J}$ vanish identically on ∂P. It is a consequence of results given, e.g., by Stratton (1941) or Jones (1964). If this last assumption is not satisfied, then the field $\mathbf{G}_0$ is not defined while $\mathbf{G}$ remains well defined.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the helpful attitude of Professors Michał Kleiber, Adam Ciarkowski, and Marek Matczyński from the Institute of Fundamental Technological Research

concerning the organization of his workplace.

APPENDIX

We shall calculate here the numerical values of L defined in (19) — with W' replaced by W given in (21) — for electron carriers in copper and silver at a temperature of 300 K and for electrons in a deuteron plasma prepared for a controlled thermonuclear fusion reaction, with the number density of nuclei $\Phi_{0D} = 10^{22}\,\mathrm{m}^{-3}$, the temperature of nuclei of 4×10^8 K, and the temperature of electrons $T = 10^7$ K. The quantities referring to electrons in copper and silver will be denoted by subscripts Cu and Ag, respectively, while those referring to electrons in the deuteron plasma will have subscript D.

The following constants are used: $c = 3.00\times10^8\,\mathrm{m\,s^{-1}}$, $c\varepsilon_o = 2.65\times10^{-3}\,\mathrm{F\,s^{-1}}$, $h_P = 6.63\times10^{-34}\,\mathrm{J\,s}$ (Planck's constant), $k = 1,38{\times}10^{-23}\,\mathrm{J\,K^{-1}}$ (Boltzmann's constant), $m_e = 9.11{\times}10^{-31}\,\mathrm{kg}$ (the rest mass of electron), $N_A = 6,02\times10^{23}\,\mathrm{mol^{-1}}$ (Avogadro's number), $Q = -1.60\times10^{-19}\,\mathrm{C}$ (the electric charge of electron).

We define

$$W_{av} = 3W = (3/2)\,kT\eta, \tag{A1}$$

$$(1/2)\,m_e u_{av}^2 = W_{av}. \tag{A2}$$

We see that u_{av} is an averaged speed of electrons and W_{av} is their average kinetic energy in the non-relativistic range of velocities when these electrons move in all 3 space directions. It will be shown that for the electron plasma in copper and silver at 300 K we get $c^{-1}u_{av} < 5\times10^{-3}$. Therefore we may neglect the relativistic corrections to the mass and kinetic energy of electrons. As far as electrons in the plasma at 10^7 K are concerned, we receive $c^{-1}u_{av} < 0.08$. In this case we also neglect the relativistic corrections, since this may cause at most a few per cent error of L_D.

Assume that the Fermi-Dirac statistics correctly describes the energy and velocity distributions of electrons in electron plasma. If we consider electron plasma contained in a cube with a volume v in physical space, then the volume of the elementary cell in the momentum space is h_P^3/v. Each cell contains at most 2 electrons. Hence, if ζ_0 denotes the maximum energy of electrons at 0 K, and W_{0av} is the average energy corresponding to ζ_0, we get

$$\zeta_0 = h_P^2(8m_e)^{-1}(3\Phi_0/\pi)^{2/3}, \qquad W_{0av} = 0.6\,\zeta_0. \tag{A3}$$

If $kT/\zeta_0 \ll 1$, then we may neglect the increase of the average energy caused by temperature and put

$$W_{av} = W_{0av}. \tag{A4}$$

If $kT/\zeta_0 \gg 1$, then the Fermi-Dirac statistics becomes that of Maxwell and we may set $\eta = 1$. The exact analysis (see, e.g., Weizel 1955) gives for kT/ζ_0 much smaller than 1:

$$W_{av} = W_{0av}[1 + (5\pi^2/12)(kT/\zeta_0)^2] + O[(kT/\zeta_0)^4].$$

If kT/ζ_0 is much greater than 1 then from formulas in Weizel's book one may infer (see also, e.g., Tamm 1957) that $\eta = 1$ with a good accuracy if

$$\Phi_0\,h_P^3(2\pi m_e kT)^{-3/2} < 0.01 \quad \text{or} \quad T > 1.3\times10^{-13}\,\Phi_0^{2/3}.$$

Therefore, for $\Phi_{0D} = 10^{22}\,\mathrm{m}^{-3}$ and $T = 10^7\,\mathrm{K}$, we get $\eta_D = 1$. From (A1) and (A2) we receive then $c^{-1}u_{avD} < 0.08$.

We calculate now ζ_0 for copper and silver. The mass of 1 mole of Cu is 63.5 g and of Ag is 108 g. Assume that the specific mass at 300 K of Cu is $8.9\,\mathrm{Mg\,m}^{-3}$, and of Ag is $10.5\,\mathrm{Mg\,m}^{-3}$. Hence the number densities of atoms of Cu and Ag are, respectively, $8.4\times10^{28}\,\mathrm{m}^{-3}$ and $5.9\times10^{28}\,\mathrm{m}^{-3}$. The average number of electrons given to the electron plasma by one atom at 300 K is, respectively, 1.3 and 1.03 (see, e.g., Szczeniowski 1955, Clemmow 1973). Therefore, at 300 K

$$\Phi_{0Cu} = 11\times10^{28}\,\mathrm{m}^{-3}, \quad \Phi_{0Ag} = 6.1\times10^{28}\,\mathrm{m}^{-3}, \tag{A5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{0Cu} &= 1.3\times10^{-18}\,\mathrm{J}, \quad W_{0avCu} = 0.78\times10^{-18}\,\mathrm{J}, \\ \zeta_{0Ag} &= 0.88\times10^{-18}\,\mathrm{J}, \quad W_{0avAg} = 0.53\times10^{-18}\,\mathrm{J}. \end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

Formulas (A6) specify the maximum and average energies which the electrons would have at 0 K, were the numbers densities of electrons at 0 K equal to Φ_{0Cu} and Φ_{0Ag} given by (A5). For T=300 K we have $kT/\zeta_{0Cu} = 3.2\times10^{-3}$, $kT/\zeta_{0Ag} = 4.7\times10^{-3}$. Therefore we may use (A4). From the approximate formula $u_{av} = (2W_{0av}m_e^{-1})^{1/2}$ we get $c^{-1}u_{avCu} < 4.6\times10^{-3}$, $c^{-1}u_{avAg} < 3.9\times10^{-3}$. It results from the Fermi-Dirac statistics that for nearly all electrons in copper and silver $c^{-1}u < 7\times10^{-3}$ at $T = 300\,\mathrm{K}$.

Taking into account (A1), (A4), (A5), (A6), we obtain from (19) and (21) that at 300 K

$$\begin{aligned} L_{Cu} &= -1.0\times10^{15}\,\mathrm{V\,m}^{-2}, \quad c\,\varepsilon_0\,L_{Cu} = -2.7\times10^{12}\,\mathrm{A\,m}^{-2}, \\ L_{Ag} &= -3.8\times10^{14}\,\mathrm{V\,m}^{-2}, \quad c\,\varepsilon_0\,L_{Ag} = -1.0\times10^{12}\,\mathrm{A\,m}^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

On grounds of (A1), (A3), and (A4) we notice that L_{Cu} and L_{Ag} should not practically depend on temperature in an interval within which the number densities (A5) remain nearly constant. Replacing W_{av} in (A1) by W_{0av} from (A6), we receive for $T = 300\,\mathrm{K}$

$$\eta_{Cu} = 126, \quad \eta_{Ag} = 85. \tag{A8}$$

Taking into account $\eta_D = 1$, we obtain for $T = 10^7\,\mathrm{K}$

$$L_D = -2.4\times10^{10}\,\mathrm{V\,m}^{-2}, \qquad c\,\varepsilon_0\,L_D = -6\times10^{7}\,\mathrm{A\,m}^{-2}. \tag{A9}$$

References

Bochenek, K., *Metody analizy pól elektromagnetycznych.* (Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa–Wrocław, 1961), pp. 30–31.

Clemmow, P. C. and Dougherty, J. P., *Electrodynamics of particles and plasmas.* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Ma., 1969), pp. 37–38.

Clemmow, P. C., *An introduction to electromagnetic theory.* (Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 257.

de Groot, S. R., *The Maxwell equations.* Studies in Statistical Mechanics (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1969), pp. 11-37.

de Groot, S. R. and Suttorp, L. G., *Foundations of electrodynamics.* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1972), pp. 3–307.

Ferziger J. H. and Kaper, H. G., *Mathematical theory of transport processes in gases.* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1972).

Jones, D. S., *The theory of electromagnetism.* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1964), p. 40.

Landau L. D. and Lifshitz, E. M., *Statističeskaja fizika*, 2nd edn. (Nauka, Moskva, 1964).

Liénard, A., "Champ électrique et magnétique produit par une charge électrique concentrée en un point et animée d'un mouvement quelconque," L'éclairage électrique **16**, 5, 53, 106 (1898).

Lorentz, H. A., Proc. Roy. Acad. Amsterdam 254 (1902).

Lorentz, H. A., "Weiterbildung der Maxwellschen Theorie: Elektronentheorie," Enc. Math. Wiss. **14** (1904).

Lorentz, H. A., *The theory of electrons*, 2nd edn. (Dover, New York, 1915).

Schram, P. P. J. M., *Kinetic theory of gases and plasmas.* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1991).

Stratton, J. A., *Electromagnetic theory.* (McGraw-Hill, New York and London, 1941), pp. 429–430.

Szałek, M. A., "Pauli versus the Maxwell equations and the Biot-Savart law," Phys. Essays **10**, 95 (1997).

Szczeniowski, S., *Fizyka doświadczalna, część III, elektryczność i magnetyzm.* (Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa, 1955), p. 217.

Tamm, I. E., *Osnovy teorii električestva*, 7th edn. (Gosudarstvennye Izdatelstvo Tehniko – Teoretičeskoj Literatury, Moskva, 1957), §41, p.198.

Weizel, W., *Lehrbuch der theoretischen Physik.* (Springer 1955), chapter L, section IV, §1.

Wiechert, E., "Elektrodynamische Elementargesetze," Archives néerlandaises **5**, 549 (1900).